

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed May 31, 2005 (the "*Office Action*"). Claims 13, 15, 19-21, and 23-26 are pending in the Application and stand rejected. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the previously submitted response and the further explanation given in the *Office Action*. Applicants amend Claims 13, 15, 19, 23, and 24 and cancel Claim 21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner maintains the rejection of Claims 13, 15, 19-21, and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,922, which issued to Jorgensen ("*Jorgensen*"). To establish obviousness of a claimed invention under § 103, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest all elements of Applicants' claims.

As an example, consider Applicants' independent Claim 13, as amended, which recites:

A multi-protocol packet-based base station, comprising:
a wireless signaling logic unit for handling communications with a mobile wireless device using wireless signals adapted for an internet protocol-based local area network;
a media gateway logic unit adapted to handle communication signals for a media gateway control protocol (MGCP); and
address generation logic for dynamically generating a virtual circuit identity code (VCIC) associated with the mobile wireless device for linking communication signals between said wireless signaling logic unit and said media gateway logic unit, wherein the VCIC enables signaling, with the mobile wireless device using a first protocol and with a remote endpoint using MGCP, for the establishment of a media communication session between the mobile wireless device and the remote endpoint.

Applicants respectfully submit that AAPA and *Jorgensen*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of this Claim.

Among other aspects of Claim 13, the AAPA-*Jorgensen* combination fails to teach or suggest “address generation logic for dynamically generating a virtual circuit identity code (VCIC) for linking communication signals between said wireless signaling logic unit and said media gateway logic unit.” The Examiner admits that AAPA fails to teach or suggest this element and instead relies upon *Jorgensen* (as teaching the previously presented portions of this claim element prior to amendment). *Office Action*, page 4. For the previously presented portions of this element, the Examiner points to *Jorgensen*’s discussion of a wireless base station (302) and a data network (142) and states that *Jorgensen*’s “wireless base station must have address generation logic for generating a virtual circuit identification code so that the traffic can be properly routed to/from ATM virtual circuits and the wireless interface.” *Id.*, at page 5. In the Office Action, the Examiner further clarifies that ATM networks can employ dynamically created switched virtual circuits (SVCs) for transporting data.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s proposed interaction between *Jorgensen*’s wireless base station and data network simply deals with the potential routing of ATM cells across ATM virtual circuits. That is, the ATM virtual circuit identifiers merely enable appropriate routing of ATM cells. The routing functions provided by ATM virtual circuit identifiers, however, do not teach or suggest an identity code that enables signaling between disparate signaling protocols. In Applicants’ claim, the virtual circuit identity code enables signaling, with the mobile wireless device using a first protocol and with a remote endpoint using MGCP, for the establishment of a media communication session between the mobile wireless device and the remote endpoint. *Jorgensen* fails to teach or suggest these claimed aspects.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 103 rejection of independent Claim 13. For analogous reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 103 rejections of independent Claims 15, 23, and 24. Furthermore, because Claims 19-20, 25, and 26 each depend from an independent claim shown above to be allowable over AAPA and *Jorgensen*, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 103 rejections of Claims 19-21, 25, and 26.

Conclusions

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending Claims. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

No fees are believed to be due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Kurt M. Pankratz
Reg. No. 46,977

Date: August 29, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number:

05073